

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
December 6, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, December 6, 2017 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea and Larry Spang.

175 Federal Street - continuation

Adam Krauth and Nicole Bergman submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to alter an attic window on rear elevation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/17
- Photographs

The applicant was not present.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue until the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 20th. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

4 Federal Court - continuation

Shelly Young submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install vent pipe.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/5/17
- Photographs

The applicant Shelly Young was not present.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue until the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 20th. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

14 Cambridge Street

Ballou Family submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship for approval of replacement shutters (after the fact) and removal of Clerks Certificate.

Ms. McCrea arrived at this time.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested to withdraw the application. She stated that the current owner has worked with the City Solicitor to draft language in the Purchase & Sale Agreement to ensure that the pending new owner will be responsible for satisfying the condition of the lien on the property to remove vinyl shutters and reinstall historically-appropriate wood shutters.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to accept the request to withdraw. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

24 ½ Winter Street

Krisna and Sarah Gaddipati submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace window in rear ell

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/28/17
- Photograph of existing window
- Mockup of proposed window
- Dimensional drawing of new window

The applicants Krisna and Sarah Gaddipati were present. Their architect, Helen Sides, was also present.

Ms. Sides noted that the applicant would like to open up the wall for a view to the exterior. Many windows are large scale with a 2/1 configuration and large glass. The new window will be a combination of operable and fixed glass.

Ms. Gaddipati presented a petition from neighbors who are in favor of the proposed window.

Ms. Bellin asked if the new window will have heavy black trim as indicated in the proposed drawings. Ms. Sides replied no.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. McCrea made a motion to accept the application as presented. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

266 Lafayette Street

Paul Frederick deNapoli and Tyna Hall submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness replace stair treads and replace garage doors (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Applications: 11/8/17
- Photographs

The applicant Tyna Hall was present.

Ms. Herbert asked if the neighbors at #268 plan to replace their stairs too. Ms. Hall replied yes, at the same time they will renovate the porches.

Ms. Herbert asked if the riser height will need to be adjusted and if the Azek will be the same thickness as the wood. Ms. Hall replied that the Azek will be used for both treads and risers and the treads will be from the Mahogany collection.

Ms. Herbert noted that the other owner at #268 will also need to submit an application and apply to do the same work. Ms. Hall replied that the neighbors have agreed to allow them to paint their stairs in the interim.

Ms. Herbert asked if the handrail would be raised to meet code. Ms. Hall replied no. Ms. Herbert added that the other owner should write a letter to the Commission confirming their consent for the work on the conjoined front stairs.

Ms. McCrea asked if the Building Inspector will have any concerns with the riser height. Ms. Herbert replied that the applicant should discuss that with the Building Inspector. Ms. Hall noted that the stringers are spaced 16" apart but are doubled and Azek recommends that they be 12" apart and this will be discussed with the Inspector.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the Azek treads will be the same thickness. Ms. Hall replied that she did not know. Ms. Herbert added that the difference in thickness would be minimal.

Ms. Herbert asked if the base at the balustrade was in good condition and if it would need to be replaced. Ms. Hall replied that the existing would be reused.

Mr. Hart asked if the risers would be painted white. Ms. Hall replied yes. Ms. Herbert noted that the paint on the stairs of 268 will need to match the color as close to possible.

Mr. Spang asked how the Azek riser edge would be treated and noted that it would be good to know what is proposed since the Commission would not want a ripped edge of a piece of decking shown. Ms. Hall replied that there might be a tread piece that fits the shape of a riser. Ms. Herbert asked that be confirmed.

Ms. Herbert asked when the work will be done. Ms. Hall replied January 1st and noted that the contractor is waiting on an approval from the Commission so he can order the materials.

Ms. Bellin asked what the proposed timing was for painting the stairs. Ms. Hall replied that all of the work will be completed at the same time.

Ms. Herbert stated that an application from the owners of 268 would be required for their stairs to be painted.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Gary Gill stated that beveled edges are available for Azek treads.

Nelson Dyonne stated that Azek pieces can be cut and painted.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve with Azek treads with typical tread nosing configuration at the riser, painted to match the existing tread and riser color.

Mr. Hart made a motion to amend his motion to include the matching of all new trim color. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The Commission discussed the request to approve the garage doors after the fact.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the garage doors are newly installed. Mr. Hart noted that the historical garage doors had 2 rows of lites at the top and the new doors only have 1 row. Ms. Herbert asked if two rows of lites were available. Ms. Hall replied that their goal was to match the period of the structure and not what was existing but to install doors that were period appropriate.

Ms. Herbert asked what material the doors are because they resembled composite. Ms. Hall replied wood.

Ms. Bellin requested that a specification of the door be submitted so the Commission will know what was installed. Ms. Hall replied that she would obtain one.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the garage door discussion to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 20th. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

277 Lafayette Street

Henry T. Realty submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter rear porch railings.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/8/17
- Photographs

The applicant Steve Gagnon, owner, was present.

Mr. Gagnon stated that the deck is in rough shape, they want to replace it with wood, and to raise the railing up to 42" high to meet code. A 2x6 had been added on top of the existing handrail previously but the applicant is now seeking to install a true full height guardrail.

Ms. Kelleher noted that a change in railing height required a public hearing. Mr. Gagnon noted that he received a verbal okay from the Building Inspector to replace most of the porch in kind and they want a complete railing for the added strength.

Ms. Herbert asked if the lattice in the photograph was existing. Mr. Gagnon replied that the contractor has recently installed it. The Commission discussed the configuration of the lattice. Ms. Keller suggested that the portion of the lattice currently black be painted white. Ms. Herbert replied that the lattice is on a diagonal and of a large scale, both of which the Commission does not approve.

Ms. Herbert asked which Contractor the applicant was using. Mr. Gagnon replied Mark Tremblay.

Ms. Bellin asked if they were replacing the third floor railing that is currently 36" high. Mr. Gagnon replied no. Ms. Bellin noted that they will match in style but not height.

Ms. Herbert stated that the Commission needs railing details. Mr. Gagnon replied that a typical Brosco cap will be used, the rail and balusters would be 2x2, and the wood would be fir. Mr. Spang noted the documents provided mention options A and B but no A & B details were presented. He stated that the Commission can't approve the options without seeing the designs first.

Ms. Herbert asked if the bottom rail would be above a plinth block. Mr. Gagnon replied that he asked the Contractor for a replication and the only change is 42" railing height. Ms. Herbert noted that the new plinth blocks look smaller than the existing which would be an issue if the bottom rail does attach to it.

Ms. Hart asked the applicant to return with a rail design. Mr. Spang requested two options, the first with two rails – one at 36" high and the other at 42" high, and the second with just a 42" rail. Ms. Herbert asked that it be clear if the 36" high rail would have a reinforcement on the outside of the rail or integrated into rail so the balusters pass through it. Mr. Hart noted that he would prefer to raise the entire assembly to 42" with no intermediate system.

There was no public comment

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the discussion to the January 3rd scheduled meeting, requested the applicant bring detailed drawings for proposed railing configuration. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Herbert stated that the lattice will be reviewed at the January 3rd meeting and asked if the area behind the lattice was used for storage. Mr. Gagnon replied that it is used to store trash barrels. Ms. Herbert suggested that the applicant consider a door and not lattice for longevity.

132 Essex Street

The Peabody Essex Museum submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to the Phillip Library buildings.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/15/17
- Photographs
- Drawings by Schwartz/Silver Architects

The applicant Bob Monk of The Peabody Essex Museum (PEM) was present. John Traficonte of Schwartz/Silver Architects and Philip Johns, PEM Senior Project Manager, were also present.

Mr. Monk discussed the proposed renovation to the Philips Library buildings. The PEM has no current plans to move the library collections back into this building at least for the next 5-7 years. The Stacks Building (main collections storage building) is not adequate to receive those collections. The collections were moved off-site 5 years ago and the catalog was converted to the Library of Congress. The storage space requirement for the collection has increased dramatically since then and the square footage necessary will continue to increase. The Stacks Building square footage is currently 2 times undersized and is not code compliant for staff use. The cost to make this space complaint exceeds the value of the building, which is already too small. There are no current resources to make that kind of investment in this building so the collections will be kept in Rowley, where they will be fully accessible with public hours, be stored in a conservation environment and in a secure facility. The current use of the Phillips Library buildings – Plummer Hall and the Daland House - going forward will be the same as before – offices. The Saltonstall and Phillips Reading Rooms will get refreshed and refinished, the Dow period rooms will be restored, and those spaces will be made available for museum and public use.

Flora Tonthat asked if any local areas, such as along Highland Avenue, were considered to house the collections locally. Mr. Monk replied that the library collections have been inadequately stored for generations. The PEM looked extensively in Salem and the surrounding areas but the best building was in Rowley, where both the museum and library collections can be stored together. The PEM looked at existing buildings and purchasing land to build a new building.

A member of the audience (name not available) asked if the building in Rowley was existing. Mr. Monk replied yes, it is a 120,000 square foot existing building that is being renovated. The member stated that the Phillips Library should continue to have some documents in it. Mr. Monk replied that some books and documents will remain there; however, the bulk of documents won't be there.

Mr. Traficonte stated that there is a lot of buildings of merit on this historic block on Essex Street. The proposed internal renovation to the buildings won't change the function or preclude the library from returning to the building in the future.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification on the Historical Commission's jurisdiction in regards to the renovations to the building. Mr. Monk stated that Plummer Hall and the Daland building are in the historic district. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission jurisdiction relates to exterior changes visible from a public way located in the Washington Square Historic District.

History of the Phillips Library building

Mr. Traficonte stated that the Philips Library is comprised of two main buildings, Plummer Hall on the left side and Daland House on the lower right. They are connected by a central connector with a book vault in the rear. A boiler room was added to the right rear in the 1960's.

- 1851: Daland House was constructed
- 1856: Plummer Hall was constructed

- 1906 – 1907: Essex Institute 2 story Connector was constructed with brownstone details
1913: Book Vault off of ell at right rear was constructed
1966: Connector expansion to the north was constructed (connector is now 3 stories). Construction of a new boiler room, library stacks at right rear, three story fire escape added at left side of Plummer Hall at the left rear corner
1997: Bathroom renovation, ramp and wood porch were constructed, as well as other renovations and MEP upgrades

Proposed exterior alterations:

- West facade (left): [Armory Park] Removal of fire escape and associated doors at each level and reinstalling windows to match the others on that façade door, new egress stair from large meeting room, and a new egress door onto the porch but in a more concealed location.
- North facade (rear): Removal of the temporary wood stairs and shed that provides basement access, chain link fence, stack, and salvaging the Grimshawe portico. New porch across the entire back of the connector in keeping with the existing Colonial façade, and new stairs to grade. Construction of a new ramp into the basement with a brick retaining wall that will be integrated into the garden. Removal of boiler room and Stacks building, and restoring the bricked in-filled window opening along the elevation, which will provide better views to the backyard and the potential for more green space.
- South facade (front): The existing historic portico brownstone stair will be removed and placed in storage and an internal stair will be constructed inside the building to ascend from the first floor to grade internally. A new glass curtain wall connector with frameless joints for a clean and transparent look will be added approximately 7 feet in front of the existing connector wall.

First Floor Alterations:

Removal of the wood stair at rear (North) façade, removal of shed and chain link fence. Elevator will be brought up to code using the same shaft but elevator doors will be located at both the front and rear of the cab providing access to all floor levels. The Grimshawe portico will be removed and stored and a new egress door will be added from Plummer Meeting Room. A new north entry porch will be added at the rear, new meeting room in existing vault, new service ramp down to basement with brick privacy wall, providing a new egress stair within existing vault structure. New accessible front entrance with new lift and foyer (will move to grade internally) to provide Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB)- required accessibility and new glass connector with a curtain wall system so it will be visible from the outside.

Mechanical equipment will have to be located on the roof above the North façade and it will barely be visible from as far away as from Brown Street. New masonry openings with cast stone headers will be installed along the South façade (front). The window at the upper floors of the connector will be renovated and having a full height curtain wall will preserve the entry.

Ms. Herbert stated that many letters were submitted by residents expressing concerns about the removal of the library collections and not about the proposed exterior building alterations.

Mr. Hart proposed a site visit to review the proposal, which includes a complicated entry redesign. Mr. Monk noted that a time can be set up to review the plans on site. Mr. Traficonte added that the design development plans can be made available to them to review on site.

Ms. Herbert asked if this project will be reviewed by other Salem Boards, which would allow for additional opportunity for public input. Mr. Monk replied that the SRA, DRB, and Planning Board will also review the project.

Ms. Spang asked what uses are in the existing building. Mr. Monk replied that the building has no current uses. The space previously housed the collections and a staff of approximately 6 people, including the exhibition design and planning department who occupied the space up until 2011. The reading rooms and Plummer Auditorium will remain. The proposed use will be museum offices with the rest of the space to be determined. 36 staff members have been temporarily housed at rental space at 10 Federal Street.

Mr. Spang asked if the public will have access to the reading rooms. Mr. Monk replied not for the next 5-7 years at least, as there is not enough space to house the collections which is the driving force. The PEM looked at the Armory Building where the PEM owns 2 floors. However, that space is currently full of museum collections and it will take 2 to 3 years to move these items properly. Studies were done and the Phillips Library collections could fit in the Armory but that is not the current plan.

Ms. Herbert asked if a new facility is being built and if it would house the other collections. Mr. Monk replied that an existing building is being renovated and will be completed in January and yes, all of the collections can be housed there. He added that almost all of the PEM houses currently contain collections.

Ms. Herbert asked if there is a way to separate the library collection from the museum collection and make them available sooner. Mr. Monk replied that the library collection will be available in March 2018 in Rowley where there is space to care for the collections properly. He stated that nothing else was available closer to Salem and the PEM didn't want to separate the collections because constructing a space for each specific purpose with the necessary security, fire protection, fire detection, conservation environments would be very expensive. Therefore, the PEM chose not to separate the collections. The new building will include a conservation lab and photography lab as well as other services that are not currently available to the PEM.

Ms. Herbert asked for the square footage of the library's current space. Ms. Monk replied approximately 30,000 square feet. Ms. Herbert asked if that is the square footage available to them in the Armory Building. Mr. Traficonte added that the Armory space would only work for moveable compact storage.

Ms. Herbert asked if there were any provision to provide transportation to the Rowley facility given its relatively remote location. Mr. Monk replied no. Ms. Herbert stated that providing transportation should be considered.

Mr. Spang asked how the Reading Room differs from a library. Mr. Monk replied that the Reading Room was used for public meetings. It will house portions of library collections that are frequently used by staff but will not be open for use by the public except for certain instances.

Ms. Bellin asked how Plummer Hall will be used. Mr. Monk replied as public and museum meeting space and for programs. Mr. Traficonte added that the 1st floor spaces will have the same use as before and the connector can be used as a spill-over space for meetings.

Ms. Kelleher asked how the glass wall will be treated against the brownstone trim. Mr. Traficonte replied that the glass will be tucked in behind the quoins of Plummer Hall and Daland House so that the glass will float between the buildings. Ms. Herbert asked for any existing examples of the glass wall being proposed. Mr. Monk replied no, but noted that their new building under construction at East India Marine Hall will have the same treatment and this treatment would tie the buildings to the museum.

Mr. Cutting asked what the purpose the glazing will serve at the connector. Mr. Traficonte replied that the glazing will create an interior accessible entry from the street where the existing brownstone steps are currently located forward of the façade. Mr. Spang asked what the grade difference would be. Mr. Traficonte replied approximately 6 feet. Ms. Herbert noted that it would also allow the new entry to be climate controlled.

Ms. McCrea stated that despite their good presentation she is concerned with the PEM taking three years to plan this renovation and the Commission is only now hearing about it. The PEM is matching the exterior historic details but is taking away the original mission of the museum. The PEM is not preserving what started the museum. She

stated that she believed that removing the research materials from the building is not a good idea and she finds it upsetting. Mr. Monk replied that this process took three years because of all the moving parts - determining how all the buildings and their use will work together, and preserving the museums historic collections in perpetuity.

Ms. Herbert stated that the historic books and manuscripts are as important as the museum collections; the museum collections shouldn't supersede the availability and use of those books. Not allowing public use of the Essex Institute Library building is a problem. Rowley is not accessible to the Salem community and as of now no transportation is being provided by the PEM for library visitors to get there. Mr. Herbert stated that it could take 2 to 3 years to carefully remove the museum collection from the 2nd and 3rd floors of the Armory and at least 1 year to move the book collections back into it. Mr. Monk replied that the PEM has not determined if and when the manuscripts could be moved into the Armory. He added that the historic manuscripts will require a conservation environment and proper storage. Ms. Herbert added that the PEM needs to consider how they will address the availability of the collections for research.

Mr. Spang asked what other 1st floor improvements are planned in the buildings. Mr. Monk replied that the layout will remain, older alterations will be removed and the original details will be restored. Mr. Traficonte added that the bathrooms will become accessible and the elevator will connect all the spaces. The existing stair might require a new 42" high guardrail and a wall mounted handrail; however, the existing stair will remain. Mr. Monk replied that all of the plumbing, electrical, fire protection, etc. will be new. Mr. Traficonte added that the boilers will be replaced, new VRF HVAC units will be added in the attic with piping fed through the walls in lieu of ductwork.

Mr. Traficonte added that a Design Development set of plans can be made available at a walk-thru by the Commission.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment regarding the proposed exterior renovations to the Phillips Library buildings.

Gary Gill, Ward 3 resident, stated his opinion that the proposed removals at the rear of the building and the proposed replacement of the glass at the front upper window is okay. He stated that he was not in favor of the proposed glass front because it will not fit in with the street and this is the most beautiful part of the city. He understands why they want to do it but the modern enclosing of the entry idea doesn't work with the building's façade and curb appeal. He stated that the buildings should stay as they are. Residents haven't used the museum in years and now Salem's history will be relocated to where it can't be easily accessed. Residents still won't be able to access the building, and there will be a loss of tourism and much needed tax money. The house that faces Brown Street needs to be cleaned up even if they continue to use the rear yard as an employee parking lot.

Jen Ratliff expressed her agreement with there being no glass at the front façade and the building can be made accessible from the rear. She noted that there are many issues that need to be addressed. She asked what will happen to the Grimshaw House portico door. Mr. Monk replied that it will go into museum collection storage.

Robin Woodman, a member of the Salem Historical Society and Harvard Art Museum, stated that the removal at the rear is understandable; however, the proposed glass front is aesthetically unpleasing and there seems to be no need for it. Since the building will only be accessible to the public when they are invited in, the PEM is taking away Salem residents' access to the Phillips Library, which has already been closed to residents for 6 years. The Philips Library is a world renowned research library and requiring scholars to go to Rowley for research is an insult to Salem. She also expressed concern about why it took so long for this plan to come forward.

Mary Jane Kelly of 129 Essex Street expressed her concern that the introduction of the glass entrance would detract from the streetscape façade of the Library buildings along a part of Essex Street that is full of history. She believes that an agreement should be reached with the residents and asked if the rear entry be made accessible and the front façade be left as is.

Kevin O'Connor stated that he lives on the first floor of 129 Essex Street and the Library's front stairs are across from his windows. He stated that he felt the glass entry wall would destroy the look of the buildings. He asked if the

construction egress would be from the rear. Mr. Monk replied yes.

Keith Crook, Ward 1 resident, stated that while the PEM can be a good neighbor sometimes, it has not been a good neighbor to those living near the Essex Block. He asked if the residential neighbors could add glass boxes to their historic homes for accessibility too? He noted that people with mobility issues shouldn't have to enter in through a back door like a second class citizens, but if the Library buildings will only be for museum staff and not the public, why not make the main entrance at the rear and not alter the aesthetics of the front façade.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment regarding the Phillips Library Collection.

Flora Tonthat expressed concern that there will be a complete disconnect with the PEM documents, the researchers, and Salem residents. People will miss out on walking around the city and connecting with the history written about in the books. There needs to be a balance between the collections and the living history of Salem.

Rod Kessler, Ward 1 resident, stated that he used the library in the past and that the Peabody complex hours weren't the best. An option for the PEM to consider could be with advanced notice to make books available to read in the reading room since a large space isn't necessary for research.

Asaom Martinez, Washington Square, asked what square footage of the library was available to the public in 2011 and what square footage will be again. Mr. Traficonte replied that the entire building is 30,000 square feet and 6-7,000 square feet was available to the public and will be again, in 2 floors of Plummer Hall and the 1st floor of Daland.

Deb Prentice, 16 Hardy Street, asked if there was space in the Armory for the museum to use as office space so the Library buildings could be given back to the residents. Mr. Monk replied that it could in the future. Ms. Prentice noted that it's taken 6 years to come this far, it will take 2-3 years to move the collections out of the Armory and to create the new office space at the Philips Library and Daland House. The PEM keeps taking from the residents and she questioned how much more of their local, state, and national history will be taken away and how can the PEM justify their actions. This needs to be rethought and some of this history given back to the people.

Elizabeth Peterson, Orne Street, asked for the square footage of the new space in Rowley to meet the PEM needs, the existing square footage at Plummer Hall, Daland House, Stacks Building, and the Armory building, so that she could understand why Salem was eliminated as a option for collections storage. Mr. Monk replied 112,000 square feet in Rowley, 32,000 square feet at Plummer Hall and Daland House, and 35,000 square feet in the Armory.

Jason Callus, Orne Street, asked for the square footage of the warehouse in Peabody. Mr. Traficonte replied that items weren't stored properly in Peabody so the collections require more square footage for proper storage. He stated that for proper storage, approximately 30,000 square feet is needed. Mr. Monk replied that those items are currently being housed within compact storage.

Jerry Smith, Salem Common Neighborhood Association, expressed his concern with the lack of transparency with this project, noting that this has not gone over well with the community. The PEM should stop and rethink this idea, and educate the community on what they are doing and why. All of the neighbors will be affected financially and socially, as well as the businesses, by the proposed construction at the library buildings on Essex Street from construction equipment and street closures, etc. The PEM should have come to the neighbors prior to present their ideas in an open forum to the city. The neighbors will have to close their blinds to the shield the light from a glass connector. The PEM offices use the rear yard of the Essex Block as a parking lot now, which makes the neighbors' property values go down. Kids going to school now have to interact with PEM vehicles entering that parking lot at the rear.

Ms. Herbert stated that this project could have tremendous support if the book collection went back into the City. The PEM should consider the timing and rethinking of their ideas.

Ms. Kelleher asked if handicapped parking will be provided in their rear parking area. Mr. Traficonte replied no.

Mr. Spang stated that he is surprised that the structure won't be operated as a traditional museum any longer and suggested that like Harvard, the books be transported back and forth from their storage facility and made available to the public with some advanced notice, instead of telling people to travel to an industrial building in Rowley to learn about the history of Salem. He noted that an ADA entrance cannot be a separate entrance and a new accessible rear entry would have to be used by everyone. He expressed his disappointment with the PEM's efforts at the rear of the PEM museum along Charter Street, which is being used like a service yard or alleyway. The Essex Block has suffered from the same treatment for years and it's a disgrace. A 6 foot high fence to shield the neighbors on Brown Street from the view into the rear yard isn't enough; the PEM needs to think about this rear yard in a new way. The rear parking could be eliminated as mitigation since everyone else parks off-site. He suggested turning the rear yard into a garden. He recommended the PEM reconsider its proposal to install a glass entry wall on Essex Street and suggested three alternatives for the PEM to explore: 1) Install a front porch and not an enclosure since the installation of a glass wall would make the facade flat and dark; 2) Create a side entry at Armory Park and activate that area as an accessible entrance; and 3) Use the rear yard as the main entry and leave the front door alone since the front has kept its historical façade all this time.

Mr. Traficonte replied that in terms of historic recognition, Tupper Hall and the Daland House were originally two separate buildings with an alley between them. The connector brought them together and now it is difficult to tell that there are multiple structures. He stated that he believed the changes as proposed would visually bring the buildings back as separate entities with their own identities, no longer blurring the historic fabric. The new changes would allow the identification of the buildings as separate spaces with a glass wall reading as neutral veil and not a modern piece. Low iron glass, which is completely transparent, would allow the brick façade to be seen behind it.

Ms. Herbert stated that this idea is copied from the PEM's new gallery building which is modern. She expressed concern that with the Phillips Library buildings, the proposed glass wall would join two antique buildings with a modern piece that doesn't fit. Mr. Monk replied that they will consider other options.

Ms. Bellin stated that the connector itself is distinctive enough and the introduction of a glass wall would be a negative element. The connector is brick which unifies the structure. She asked if the connector and accessible entrance could be provided at the front without glass. Mr. Traficonte replied that the new vestibule could be brick but they will still need to address the 6 foot grade difference.

Mr. Hart suggested a motion to continue with a site visit.

Ms. Herbert suggested a walk-through to review the "temporary" Charter Street situation versus what the end result will be. She asked if there were any plans for the Daniel Bray House at the rear of the Essex Street property because it needs action and could be used by the public again. Mr. Monk replied in this has been discussed but no work is planned for at least the next two years.

Ms. Herbert suggested working groups to get public input for future plans for the rear yard so residents can feel included. She also suggested the PEM require its employees to park in the garage like everyone else.

Ms. Herbert asked what the square footage is for the first and second floors of Plummer Hall. Mr. Monk replied that the footprint is approximately 4,700 square feet per floor, 10,000 at the most and not enough to house the collections.

Ms. Herbert stated than all e-mails and letters will be entered into the record and a copy will be given to the PEM, and any future letters should be submitted via e-mail to Patti Kelleher.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue with a proviso that the Commission conduct a site visit. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.
Mr. Hart made a motion to amend the previous motion to continue the discussion to the January 3rd meeting. Ms. McCrea second the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.
A site visit will be conducted on a Saturday at 10AM prior to the January 3rd meeting.

Ms. Herbert asked when construction is expected to be complete. Mr. Monk replied that they are hoping to complete construction by the end of 2018, with approximately 6-8 months of construction.

Ms. Herbert asked what the existing square footage is of the neighboring buildings next to the main museum buildings on Essex Street. Mr. Monk replied 12,000, 10,000, and 14,000 square feet, although they are in poor shape and the first floors will remain available for retail. Mr. Traficonte noted that the bookshelves in Peabody and Rowley are 12 feet high and won't fit in Plummer Hall. Bringing books in remotely can be done, it's less expensive, and the environment can be controlled off-site.

Ms. Herbert stated that accessibility is the main issue. Ms. Bellin replied that making the volumes accessible upon request would meet the needs of the people to have them as part of the community. Mr. Spang questioned whether the reading room would be open for staff only. Mr. Monk replied yes. Storing the books off-site and bringing them to Salem for researchers is an option that has been discussed but he is unable to commit to it at this moment. Mr. Traficonte added that there are certain rare books the PEM will not want to transport back and forth. Mr. Monk stated that the public needs to be made aware of the type of items in the collection and that 30% of the collections are unique to the Phillips Library and needed to be treated as such. The last time the building was open to the public was in 2011 and it was only 2-3 per day, 3 days a week, and by appointment only.

Mr. Traficonte questioned who would access the Rowley facility versus who accessed it when it was on site. Mr. Monk stated that there is data relative to the collections and their percentage of use for genealogy survey versus maritime, local history, art, Asian export art. In the early 2000s, an average of 580 scholars per year conducted research at the library. That number has risen to 780 since the library collection moved to Peabody. The catalog is available online or someone can call to get access to what is available. The PEM also has data on the number of people who have made on-line or phone inquiries and who followed up with an on-site visit. Ms. Herbert noted that in the 1970's all of the items for research were within walking distance and there were many visiting scholars.

Ms. Bellin suggested that the most used volumes be kept locally and made accessible and the others can be located in a more remote location. Mr. Monk replied that splitting up the collection has been discussed and their current plan will not keep that from happening, those rooms will be enhanced. Mr. Spang agreed with Ms. Bellin's recommendation.

Mr. Gill suggested that the main part of collections be moved into the Armory building and the less popular items in be stored in another facility.

Jen Ratliff noted that archival space cannot be where they are proposing to add new windows to the Tupper Hall building since natural light is against archival standards. Mr. Traficonte replied that archival collections will not be in that vault space. Ms. Ratliff asked how much square footage the new building on Essex Street will have and was it considered to house the collections. Mr. Monk replied 44,000 square feet in the new gallery building. Ms. Herbert added that the new building was only considered for gallery space to exhibit the museum's large collection items that are currently not on view.

16 River Street

Kevin and Melissa Hankens submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a window.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/17/17
- Photographs

The applicant Kevin Hankens, owner, was present.

Mr. Hankens presented his application to replace an existing window. He stated that a casement window with a hand crank was existing at this location. It is not historic and doesn't match the character of the house and they want to replace it with a 6/6 true divided light window. None of the existing window configurations match.

Ms. Spang asked if the window head would be raised. Mr. Hankers replied no, the window can't be made higher due to interior ceiling height. The sill height is restricted by the countertop height, and the width can't be changed without doing work to the clapboards.

Ms. Kelleher asked who will make the window. Mr. Hankens replied that that hadn't been determined yet but it will be a friction fit window.

Mr. Spang asked for the width of the window to be replaced. Mr. Hankens replied approximately 30" wide.

Mr. Cutting stated that the Commission needed more detail.

Mr. Spang stated that the proposed window appears to be approximately 30"W x 36" H, which could make a 6/6 window configuration look odd. He suggested a 2/2 configuration and a casement to crank since it will be over a countertop. Ms. Herbert noted that some casements have built-in muntins. Mr. Cutting stated that he would prefer upper and lower sashes. Mr. Hart agreed with Mr. Cutting. Ms. Kelleher noted that once a contractor is on site, he may discover issues.

Ms. Herbert stated that the casement and sash options can be reviewed at the next meeting.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 20th. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Carpenter Street

Kimberley A. Russell submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a fence section.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/30/17
- Photographs
- Product specifications

The applicant Kimberley A. Russell was not present.

Ms. Kelleher presented the application to replace a window on the rear ell. She noted that there is a single casement window at the back of the ell and the applicant would like to change to aluminum clad by Jeldwin.

Mr. Cutting asked for the age of the building's ell Ms. Kelleher replied 1930s. The applicant requested a black window to better blend with the existing trim. There is limited visibility from Carpenter Street but the window is visible from Gifford Court.

Ms. Bellin asked if the other windows will be painted black. Ms. Kelleher replied no. Ms. McCrea stated that she would have no issue with a black window.

Mr. Spang asked if the window could be painted wood. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission has not approved the requested window type in the McIntire District yet and added that the application stated that the window "was inoperable and rusted out" but she had assumed it was wood. Mr. Hart stated that it appeared the window material in the photo is steel.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the window could be rehabbed unless it was a crank style.

There was no public comment

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 20th. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Violation Notices

278 Lafayette Street

Ms. Herbert stated that she and Sue Keenan had conducted a site visit with the owner of the property several years ago. The owner had previously removed the front porch and the Commission required him to replace it. Two years ago he started a deck without permission that has not yet been completed. Violation letters were sent to the owner in August, September, and October for this work but the owner has not responded. She asked the Commission to approve the issuance of a Clerk's Certificate, meaning he can't sell or refinance the property until this matter has been dealt with.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the listed owner of the property is the applicant's sister and all letters have been sent to her. No letters have been returned so it is assumed that the sister/owner received them. Ms. Bellin asked if the occupant also received a copy of the letters. Ms. Kelleher replied that the last letter sent was to the City Solicitor asking her to send a letter to both the owner and occupant stating that the Historic Commission was considering starting the lien process, and the owner was sent a copy. Ms. Herbert stated that these letters should be sent using certified mail to both the owner and occupant. Mr. Spang suggested that the City Solicitor send a certified letter to both owner and occupant stating that if they do not respond within a certain time frame that the Commission will proceed with a Clerks Certificate. Ms. Herbert suggested giving them 7 days to respond.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to send out a letter to both the owner and occupant stating that they must respond within 7 days and appear at the next meeting or the Clerk Certificate process will begin. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

95 Federal Street, Unit 2

Mr. Hart rescued himself and left to sit in the audience.

Ms. Herbert stated that the Commission has discussed the HVAC installation in violation with the owners since June. The owners have agreed to changes for a slight improvement to what was installed but nothing has occurred. She asked the Commission to approve the issuance of a letter requesting compliance with the changes and a response within 7 days.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to send out a letter to the owner requesting that they must respond within 7 days and note that the Commission can charge up to \$500 a per day per violation. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Superior Court and County Commissioners Buildings

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Mass Historical Commission has issued a finding of no adverse effect for the plans for warm mothballing of the historic court buildings. Ms. Cutting stated that he would like the proposed sash color to be glossy black. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Historic Commission is not an interested party, but when the City transfers ownership there will be a preservation restriction attached that could require the sash color to be a specific

color. The opinion of the Commission can be heard at the public meetings. Ms. Herbert questioned who will be designing those preservation restrictions and stated that she would work on determining when and which entity will put the restriction in place.

Hawthorne Cove Marina

Ms. Kelleher stated that changes are proposed at the marina off of Derby Street. The Mass Historical Commission submitted a letter to the marina owner stating that the property is within a National Register District and is adjacent to the House of the Seven Gables, which is a National Historic Landmark. The Mass Historical Commission requested the Marina to provide the Salem Historical Commission with information for their comment. Ms. Kelleher noted that the project consists of the construction of a 7,500 square foot marina building, a drainage pipe, tidal gate, and the demolition of several structures.

North Shore Community Development Corporation

Ms. Kelleher stated that the North Shore CDC has submitted a project notification form for its new construction projects in the Point Neighborhood. The CDC submitted the project to the Mass Historical Commission for their review. Ms. Herbert stated that she and Emily Udy of Historic Salem, Inc. met with Mickey Northcutt of the North Shore CDC to review the plans. She and Emily made some suggestions and she submitted a letter of support for the project on behalf of the Commission. Historic Salem sent a letter of support as well. Mr. Spang asked if this project was state funded. Ms. Kelleher replied that the project is both state and federally funded, and it is listed in the National Register. Ms. McCrea suggested that the Historical Commission send them a congratulatory letter for installing the house plaques after the restoration of their buildings.

384 Essex Street

Ms. Kelleher stated that David Hart emailed photos of the newly installed windows at the property to the Commission. Ms. Herbert reported that earlier this month, the contractor was removing the original interior Indian shutters installed in 1807 and throwing them in the dumpster. Ms. Schwartz of 92 Federal Street discovered the shutters and salvaged them. Eight windows were redone but only 7 shutters were recovered. It was agreed that the interior shutters should remain. Ms. Herbert stated that she would look into the matter.

VOTE: Ms. McCrea made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner